UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,520	06/25/2003	Brian S. Christian	MS1-1511US	3658

22801 7590 02/07/2007	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC	NGUYEN, CHAU T	
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500		
SPOKANE, WA 99201	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2176	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/07/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/07/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/603,520	CHRISTIAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chau Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 November 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 June 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

11/03/2007 has been entered. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.   Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claims 1, 10 and 18 contain

subject matter "the satellite assembly being configured to provide content to enable

execution by a server of a script embedded in a requested page" which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in

the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession

of the claimed invention. In this case, Applicants' pointed out in the specification (p. 7,

lines 9-12 "In addition, the localization module 202 includes multiple satellite assemblies

or dynamically linked libraries (DLLs) 210(1), 210(2) through 210(n) – (hereinafter

designated as DLL(s) 210)."; p. 4, lines 11-13 "ASP.NET (Active Server Pages) is a

server-side scripting technique promulgated by MICROSOFT CORP® that enables

server execution of scripts embedded in web pages."; p. 10, lines 14-16 "Also, the

ASP.NET guidelines for satellite assembly naming and locations must be followed for

the system to locate the localized content.", and p. 9, lines 17-19 "The page processing

subsequent to the localization includes running any scripts or page-behind code

associated with the web page.") for supporting the amended limitations.   However,

Examiner's disagreed with the Applicants.   These cited passages only mention

MICROSOFT CORP® enables server execution of scripts embedded in web pages,

NOT the satellite assembly being configured to enable execution of a script embedded

in a requested page.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Frerebeau et al. (Frerebeau), US Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0135501,

Kerr et al. (Kerr), US Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0088155, and further in view of Allard et al. (Allard), US Patent No. 6,370,561.

6.   As to independent claims 1 and 10, Frerebeau discloses a method of providing localization of a web service comprising

identifying a localization attribute (Abstract: internationalizing the content of markup documents includes detecting a tag dedicated to the localization of the document and one or more localization attributes of an element to be localized designated by the tag);

identifying a culture (page 1, paragraph [0007], page 3, paragraph [0044] : localization of a document is the procedure that consists of implementing means for transcribing said document into a given language or culture, detecting a tag to be used in the localization of the document, and one or more localization attributes);

identifying values associated with the localization attribute (Abstract and pages 2-3, paragraphs [0017]-[0019] and [0039]-[0044]: localized value of the elements associated with localization attributes);

referencing a satellite assembly associated with the identified culture to locate an identifier associated with each value associated with the localization attribute (Abstract and page 2, paragraphs [0018]-[0019] and [0032]-[0035]: searching in a storage means in a translation file (a satellite assembly) for the localized value of the element associated with localization attributes; page 3, paragraph [0042]: the localization attribute can also include identifier or parameters); and

replacing references to one or more attributes or values with content associated with the identifier in the satellite assembly (Abstract and page 1, paragraph [0017] – page 2, paragraph [0019]: replacing the tag in the document with the localized value found in the translation file (satellite assembly)).

However, Frerebeau does not explicitly disclose receiving a page request from a requester of the web service; replacing references in the requested page to one or more attributes or values in the page request with content associated with the identifier located in the satellite assembly to provide a culture-dependent response; and transmitting the culture-dependent to the requester of the web service.

Kerr discloses the user specifies to the agent or process the locale (language or culture) to combine with the application (web page) (page 1, paragraphs [0002], [0013] and page 2, paragraphs [0020]-[0021]). Kerr also discloses depending on the locale selected by the user, different objects are combined with an application or web site and delivered to the user fulfilling their request for a web page or pages in accordance with their locale and/or language (page 3, paragraph [0035]).

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kerr and Frerebeau to include receiving a page request from a requester of the web service; replacing references in the requested page to one or more attributes or values in the page request with content associated with the identifier located in the satellite assembly to provide a culture-dependent response. Kerr suggests that by separating the localized text from the

remainder of the web may reduce maintenance and storage requirements (page 1, paragraph [0011]).

Frerebeau and Kerr disclose JavaScript embedded into HTML code (Frerebeau, page 5, paragraph [0101]). However, Frerebeau and Kerr do not explicitly disclose the satellite assembly being configured to provide content to enable execution by a server of a script embedded in a requested page.

Allard discloses the client sends a request to a server that comprises a URL that identifies a script, and in response to receiving the request, the server parses the request to determine whether it is a request to load a dynamic link library (satellite assembly), and if it is, the server then locates the dynamic link library which contains a procedure which is used to pass information relating to the request to the dynamic link library (Abstract and col. 5, lines 15-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Allard with Frerebeau and Kerr to include satellite assembly being configured to provide content to enable execution by a server of a script embedded in a requested page. Allard suggests that the script maintain a reference to the object so that upon receiving a subsequent request from a client to invoke a function of an object, the referenced instance of the object can be used without instantiating a new object, thus it would avoid excessive overhead of instantiating objects.

7.   As to dependent claims 2 and 14, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose wherein
the localize attribute further comprises the value "localize" (Frerebeau, page 4,
paragraph [0075] and page 5, paragraphs [0087]-[0100]).

8.   As to dependent claims 3 and 12, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose wherein
the identifying a culture associated with the page request further comprises identifying a
culture parameter included with a page request, the culture parameter identifying a
culture (Frerebeau, page 3, paragraphs [0042]-[0044]).

9. .   As to dependent claims 4 and 13, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose wherein
the identifying a culture associated with the page request further comprises identifying
values unique to a culture in one or more headers associated with the page request
(Frerebeau, page 3, paragraphs [0039]-[0042]).

10.   As to dependent claim 5, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose wherein the
satellite assembly further comprises a dynamically linked library (DLL) (Frerebeau, page
2, paragraphs [0033]-[0036]).

11.   As to dependent claim 6, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose wherein the
content associated with the identifier located in the satellite assembly is further
comprises content specific to the identified culture (Frerebeau, page 2, paragraph
[0034]).

12.   As to dependent claims 7 and 15, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose further comprising referencing a satellite assembly associated with a default culture in the event that a satellite assembly associated with the identified culture is unavailable (Frerebeau, page 4, paragraph [0061]).

13.   As to dependent claims 8 and 15, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose wherein the default culture further comprises a culture that is predefined to be the default culture (Frerebeau, page 4, paragraph [0062]).

14.   As to dependent claims 9 and 17, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose wherein the default culture further comprises a culture that is a base culture of the identified culture, the identified culture being a culture that is derived from the base culture (Frerebeau, page 2, paragraph [0034] and page 5, paragraph [0079]).

15.   As to dependent claim 11, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose wherein the satellite assembly associated with identified culture is further configured to utilize one or more Active Server Pages guidelines to locate the localize content (Frerebeau, pages 4-5, paragraphs [0102]-[0107]).

16.   As to dependent claim 16, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard disclose wherein the default culture is a statically defined culture (Frerebeau, page 5, paragraph [0079]).

17.   Claims 18-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Frerebeau et al. (Frerebeau), US Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0135501,

and further in view of Burg et al. (Burg), US Patent No. 6,362,840.

18.   As to independent claim 18, Frerebeau discloses one or more computer-readable

media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer,

perform the following steps:

receiving a page request for web content for a preferred culture (pages 1-2,

paragraphs [0017]-[0024] and page 3, paragraph [0044]: detecting a tag to be used in

the localization of the document);

identifying a requested culture from the page request (pages 1-2, paragraphs

[0017]-[0024] and page 3, paragraph [0044]: detecting one or more localization

attributes);

determining if localized web content corresponding to the preferred culture is

available (page 3, paragraph [0044] – page 4, paragraph [0076]: retrieving the

localization attributes associated with the tags and searching for the translation file

corresponding to the target language or culture);

localizing the web content for the preferred culture if localized web content is

available for the preferred culture (page 3, paragraph [0052] – page 4, paragraph

[0073]: searching in a translation file for the localized value of the elements associated

with localization attributes); and

localizing the web content for a default culture if localized web content is not available for the preferred culture (page 3, paragraph [0052] – page 4, paragraph [0073]), wherein at least one of localizing the web content for the preferred culture and localizing the web content for a default culture includes referencing a satellite assembly to locate a localized content associated with at least one of the preferred culture and the default culture (page 5, paragraphs [0084]-[0086]).

Frerebeau discloses JavaScript embedded into HTML code (Frerebeau, page 5, paragraph [0101]). However, Frerebeau does not explicitly disclose the satellite assembly being configured to provide localized content to enable execution by a computer of a script embedded in a requested page with the provided localized content.

Burg discloses the browser (stored in a client computer) renders the web page and executes the embedded script instructions, or alternatively, the embedded scrip may instruct the to execute new objects such as DLL's (satellite assembly) that are downloaded only once, stored on the system and then immediately available on the system for subsequent use (col. 10, lines 16-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Burg and Frerebeau to include the satellite assembly being configured to enable execution of a script embedded in a requested page and this would reduces the size of the web page.

19.   As to dependent claim 19, Frerebeau and Burg disclose determining the default culture to be a predefined default culture (Frerebeau, page 3, paragraph [0052] – page 4, paragraph [0073]).

20.   As to dependent claim 20, Frerebeau and Burg disclose determining the default culture to be a based culture from which the preferred culture is derived (Frerebeau, page 3, paragraph [0052] – page 4, paragraph [0073]).

21.   As to dependent claim 21, Frerebeau and Burg disclose wherein the determining if localized web content corresponding to the preferred culture is available further comprises determining if a satellite assembly associated with the preferred culture is accessible (Frerebeau, page 2, paragraph [0034]).

22.   As to dependent claim 22, Frerebeau and Burg disclose wherein the localizing the web content further comprises: identifying a localization attribute included in the page request (Frerebeau, Abstract);

identifying key values and key attributes associated with the localization attribute (Frerebeau, Abstract); and

redirecting key values and key attributes to reference the localized web content (Frerebeau, page 1, paragraph [0017] – page 2, paragraph [0019]).

23.   As to dependent claim 23, Frerebeau and Burg disclose wherein the localization attribute further comprises the term "localize" (Frerebeau, page 4, paragraph [0075] and page 5, paragraphs [0087]-[0100]).

24.   As to dependent claim 24, Frerebeau and Burg disclose wherein the identifying a requested culture from the page request further comprises recognizing a culture parameter in the page request (Frerebeau, page 2, paragraph [0024]).

25.   As to dependent claim 25, Frerebeau and Burg disclose wherein the identifying a requested culture from the page request further comprises recognizing one or more culture-identifying values from one or more headers associated with the page request (Frerebeau, page 2, paragraph [0024] and page 3, paragraph [0039]).

Response to Arguments

In the remarks, Applicant(s) argued in substance that

A) Frerebeau fails to teach or fairly suggest referencing a satellite assembly associated with the identified culture to locate an identifier associated with each value associated with the localization attribute.

In reply to argument A, Frerebeau discloses in Abstract and page 2, paragraphs [0018]-[0019] and [0032]-[0035]: searching in a storage means in a translation file (a satellite assembly) for the localized value of the element associated with localization

attributes. Frerebeau also discloses in page 3, paragraph [0042]: the localization attribute can also include identifier or parameters.

B) The prior does not disclose the satellite assembly being configured to provide the localized content to enable the computer to execute a script embedded in a requested page with the provided localized content.

In reply to argument B, Burg discloses the browser (stored in a client computer) renders the web page and executes the embedded script instructions, or alternatively, the embedded scrip may instruct the to execute new objects such as DLL's (satellite assembly) that are downloaded only once, stored on the system and then immediately available on the system for subsequent use (col. 10, lines 16-35).

26.   Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 11/03/2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., the satellite assembly being configured to provide content to enable execution by a server of a script embedded in a requested page) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval ·(PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100